

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-24 were pending and rejected in the application.

Claims 7 and 14 were objected to due to several informalities. Applicant has corrected the typographical errors in these claims.

Claim 8, 11, 12, 20, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has hereby corrected the antecedent problems in these claims, and respectfully requests that this rejection be removed.

The Examiner also made the following rejections to the claims:

- Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Hewitt, et al.
- Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt et al. in view of Louderback and Yamamoto.
- Claims 5, 7, 13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt et al. in view of Louderback and Yamamoto as applied to Claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Steinmark.
- Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt et al. in view of Louderback, Yamamoto, and Steinmark a applied to Claim 5, and further in view of Wachob.
- Claims 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt et al. in view of Louderback and Yamamoto as applied to claims 10 and 19, and further in view of Wachob.
- Claims 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt et al. in view of Steinmark.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. Amended independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 to each require a location identifier that represents the geographic location of the radio. Claims 10 and 19 also each require determining configuration data based on the location identifier. None of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest either, let alone both of these limitations.

Applicant has also deleted Claim 4 and added new dependent claims 25 and 26 that are directed to a location identifier which is entered at a graphical interface.


For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, as well as dependent Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 are now in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested. Any questions should be directed to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

August 12, 2003

By:


Jordan A. Sigale
Reg. No. 39,028

14327329